



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,025	12/21/2000	Satoshi Iwata	1614.1106	6272

21171 7590 03/23/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/741,025

Applicant(s)

IWATA ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment forwarded to the examiner on 12/29/03 to the original application filed on 12/21/00.
2. Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02).
3. Claims 6 and 9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02) in view of Iwamura et al (US: 6,388,684 05/14/02).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02).

-In regard to independent claims 1 and 10-11, Qureshi et al teach a display system and method of controlling said system, wherein the system *determines the dimensions* (size and

Art Unit: 2178

resolution) of the *display window* (column 4, lines 52-54); a layout detection unit (browser), wherein the *layout data is integrally stored* (HTML markup elements within the HTML document) (column 2, lines 40-55) with the document data (HTML document); and a control wherein the document data was displayed as per the detected display specifications and the layout data (column 4, 53-67) (Fig. 2-8 with respect to Fig. 13). Qureshi et al further teach wherein the layout data consists of data element identifiers (Fig. 12: “div id=”SlideObj”), positional information of data elements (column 2, lines 45-55), and page format data (Fig. 12: 352 <div> tags) & (column 2, lines 50-55).

Qureshi et al and W3C do not teach wherein the method was stored on a computer readable medium as program code instructions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have stored the computer system method as a program stored on a computer readable medium because it was well known in the art to implement a computer system method as program instructions for portability of the embodiment of the invention to be used on multiple computer systems.

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Qureshi et al further teach wherein the respective position of the object automatically changes in proportion to the new size (column 4, 62-64), maintaining the positions as stated by the integrally stored layout data (Fig. 2-8 with respect to Fig. 13).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Qureshi et al further teach wherein the entire document data was displayed on the display (browser) with an *original display size* (Fig. 2),

Art Unit: 2178

where not selecting the resize image check box (Fig. 11) results in displaying the object with an original display size.

-In regard to dependent claim 4, Qureshi et al further teach wherein upon determination that at least one of the dimensions of the display window was different than the display space of a page, a scalar relating the difference was *calculated and employed to resize and reposition the object* in the display space (column 4, lines 52-65) (Fig. 3-8).

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Qureshi et al further teach the display control method selects from *a first and a second display method* wherein the first display method causes the entire document data to be displayed on the display screen with original size and the second display method causes the *resizing of the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects* to fit the browser's display window (column 16, lines 14-16: Fig. 11).

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Qureshi et al further teach a *display screen* (Fig. 1: 47) wherein a *pointing device* (column 7, lines 59-61) was used by the user to select one of a *first display method* (resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) and a *second display method* (choosing not to resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) (column 16, lines 14-16: Fig. 11).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Qureshi et al further teach a *display screen* (Fig. 1: 47) wherein an input device was used by the user to select one of a *first display method* (resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) and a *second display method* (choosing not to resize the dimensions of the graphical display of image objects to fit the browser's display window) (column 16, lines 14-16: Fig. 11). Qureshi et al do not teach a touch panel screen as a user input for selecting items. Qureshi et al do teach input devices such as a keyboard, pointing device, joystick, game pad, . . . , scanner, or the like (column 7, lines 59-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to have used a touch panel screen on Qureshi et al display to select items because a touch panel screen was a well known input method and falls into the category as described by Qureshi et al as a possible input method.

6. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al (US: 6,456,305 09/24/02) in view of Iwamura et al (US: 6,388,684 05/14/02).

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Qureshi et al do not teach wherein the display control unit allows an image of a data element with a calculated display size to be overlapped over a background image of the entire document data with original display size. Iwamura et al teach simultaneously displaying a calculated target region to be enlarged and its original image on the same display screen (column 2, lines 10-18: Fig. 1A-C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have used Qureshi et al system for automatically fitting a graphical display to the dimensions of a display window and combined Iwamura et al method for displaying a enlarged target region of an image overlapped over the

Art Unit: 2178

original image, because Iwamura et al teach by enlarging a portion of the image the target region can be readily accurately recognized (column 2, lines 22-24).

-In regard to dependent claims 6 and 9, Qureshi et al do not wherein a user can select an image of a data element with a calculated display size to be overlapped over a background image of the entire document data with original display size. Iwamura et al teach a user input means for pointing to specify an enlargement target (column 2, lines 39-40), wherein the result is simultaneously displaying a calculated target region to be enlarged and its original image on the same display screen (column 2, lines 10-18: Fig. 1A-C). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have used Qureshi et al system for automatically fitting a graphical display to the dimensions of a display window and combined Iwamura et al method for displaying a enlarged target region of an image overlapped over the original image, because Iwamura et al teach by enlarging a portion of the image the target region can be readily accurately recognized (column 2, lines 22-24).

7. *Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to independent claims 1, 10, and 11, applicant argues that the Qureshi et al do not teach wherein the layout information comprises data element identifiers, data element positions, and page format data. The examiner notes, as discussed above in the rejections of

Art Unit: 2178

claims 1, 10, and 11, that Qureshi et al clearly show the use of data element identifiers in the form of the "id" element within its HTML documents (Fig. 12), as well as data element positioning through element specific tags such as "<P>" (column 2, lines 45-55), and page format data via <DIV> tag positioning (Fig. 12: 352) as well as page structure and display layout which the examiner equates to document structure defined by the use of various other tags (column 2, lines 50-55).

In addition, applicant argues that Qureshi et al fails to disclose or suggest controlling the display layout of the display unit based on the detected display specification data and the detected layout data, so that the display layout is appropriate for the document data when being displayed on the display unit. The examiner notes that Qureshi et al do indeed teach wherein the control displayed the document data on the display as per the detected display specifications and the layout data (column 4, 53-67) (Fig. 2-8 with respect to Fig. 13).

-In regard to dependent claims 6 and 9, applicant argues that there is no teaching or suggestion of combining the teachings of Qureshi et al and Iwamura et al. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner notes that the motivation used to combine the references, which provides a clear

Art Unit: 2178

benefit to Qureshi et al, was pulled directly from the secondary reference Iwamura et al and thus the applicant's argument is rendered moot.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US: 6,023,714

02/08/00

Hill et al.

Art Unit: 2178

HTML 4.0 Specification W3C Recommendation, revised on 24-Apr-1998


<http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/> and <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/struct/global.html#h-7.5.2>

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB


STEPHEN S. RONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER